NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I

2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are ___not___ identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA*§1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: FREEHOLD BOROUGH	School: Freehold Learning Center
Chief School Administrator: DR. ROCCO TOMAZIC	Address: 30 Dutch Lane Road
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: rtomazic@freeholdboro.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: Pre-k to 5th grade
Title I Contact: Cheryl Romano	Principal: William Smith
Title I Contact E-mail: cromano@freeholdboro.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: williams@freeholdboro.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 732-761-2100	Principal's Phone Number: 732-761-2100

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

X I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

_____   _____   _____

Principal's Name (Print)   **Principal's Signature**   **Date**

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA*§1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held <u>2</u> (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.

- State/local funds to support the school were $ <u>1,092,238</u>, which comprised <u>5.5</u>% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.

- State/local funds to support the school will be $ <u>1,073,604</u>, which will comprise <u>5.1</u>% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.

- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Link it	2	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making	200-300	$9,133
Jumpstart	1	Corrective Reading	200-300	$9,000
Basic Skills and Reading Intervention Teachers	1	Corrective Reading	100-100 200-100 200-200	$232,461
Reading Workshop	1	Corrective Reading	100-600	$1,482
Extended Day	1	Corrective Reading	100-100 200-100 200-200 100-600	$20,265
Summer School	1	Corrective Reading	100-100 200-100 200-200 200-300 100-600 200-600	$36,989

Parental Involvement (Homework Diner/Family Literacy Night/Family Math Night/Family Science Night)	3	Parental Involvement: What Research Says to Administrators	100-100 200-100 200-200 200-300 200-600	$3,887

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): *"The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"*

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note**: A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.
Add lines as necessary.

Name	Stakeholder Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Signature
Natasha Perski	Reading Coach	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Colleen LaRocca	Literacy Specialist	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Yuridia Hernandez	Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kari Schmidt	Guidance Counselor	Yes	Yes	Yes	
William Smith	Principal	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cheryl Romano	Curriculum Director	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Josh Goldberg	Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:
The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
6/3/15	On-line survey	Comprehensive Needs Assessment				
6/17/15	Park Avenue Elementary School	Schoolwide Plan Development	Yes		Yes	
6/17/15	Park Avenue Elementary School	Program Evaluation	Yes		Yes	

Add rows as necessary.

School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?	We believe that all students can learn. Our staff is responsible for providing rigorous standards in order for students to reach their academic potential. Decisions regarding school community require the input of all stakeholders- teachers, administrators, parents, and students through continuous reflection on the progress that are school makes.

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

Yes, the main priority problem that we addressed was literacy. We addressed this problem through implementing an extended day program and implementing Jumpstart- a literacy intervention program that incorporates both phonics instruction and reading comprehension. Components of Jumpstart were implemented in our Basic Skills program and in Kindergarten- 1st grade.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

The main strengths of the program were the metrics we had in place to measure success. This included both pre and post assessments to gauge student growth. Another strength of the implementation was having our Reading Coach and Literacy Coordinator provide professional development and facilitate meetings with teachers throughout the year in order for Jumpstart to be effectively implemented.

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?

One of the main barriers was the lack of funding available to our school- we are the third lowest funded school district in New Jersey. If we were adequately funded we could provide more Basic Skills teachers, which would lower the teacher-student small group ratio and improve the effectiveness of our Jumpstart program. In addition, lack of space-our Kindergarten classroom are located at a Freehold Township school-and constant administrative turnover have severely hampered our ability to provide a consistently rigorous education for our students.

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?

The apparent strengths of each step include using standardized test data and diagnostic reading assessment data to identify the major weaknesses of our education program. This data then pointed us to implementing an extended day program and it helped us decide on a clear direction for our Basic Skills program, Kindergarten and 1st grade- the implementation of Jumpstart. Throughout the year, we provided ongoing professional development regarding Jumpstart implementation. This included initial PD sessions, demo lessons and debriefing sessions with an outside consultant, Reading Coach, and Literacy Coordinator. The challenge here was making sure Jumpstart was effectively implemented by all teachers. While some teachers

accurately implemented Jumpstart, there were others who struggled with effective implementation. Next year we will continue supporting and monitoring accurate Jumpstart implementation.

Another significant strength this past year was the addition of LinkIt- a comprehensive on-line educational software system that utilizes benchmark assessments to help teachers to individualize instruction to meet specific student needs. Teachers welcomed LinkIt as it was a major upgrade over the benchmarks that were previously used. Next year we look to provide teachers support and more time with analyzing benchmark data.

One of the challenges to our Extended Day program, was making sure the parent consented and provided transportation for the students to attend. We handled this by having parents sign a permission slip. We then followed this up by making phone calls to reinforce the importance that the program would have for their children.

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?

The school obtained buy-in by providing on-going professional development throughout the year for teachers. We called parents and explained the components of the Jumpstart program. We also explained specific reading strategies that were part of Jumpstart at our Literacy Night event. In addition we had parent workshops at Back to School Night and during the year.

In the past, the district had suffered from uneven programming as the two elementary schools implemented different interventions. Jumpstart, LinkIt were implemented in both school thus creating a sense of cohesion that was welcomed by all staff members.

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?

Many teachers, especially veteran teachers, have seen struggling readers in our school and are frustrated with not having a research based program to address their needs.   After researching several intervention literacy programs we chose Jumpstart. Teachers appreciated being part of the process when choosing an intervention program. We also hired a former Basic Skills teacher to be our Reading Coach. Teachers welcomed the idea of having a knowledgeable staff member to support their literacy instruction. We also captured staff perceptions through the use of surveys, such as our on-line Needs Assessment survey, and after our Learn Fair- a comprehensive day of professional development where teachers had the opportunity to choose the type of sessions that they wanted to attend.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?

As explained previously, we communicated to parents at Back School Night and Literacy Night, our annual title one meetings at each school, and Parental Information sessions for supplemental programs. All Parent involvement activities included feedback forms.

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?

The extended day program and Jumpstart program used small group instruction.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

The school incorporated three measures, F&P, Slosson word list and Sort word list, to establish Basic Skills criteria. Summer Program and extended day program utilized a multiple measures matrix.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Over a 12-week period the students in the extended day program received literacy instruction three days a week and each session was a half hour. Students in Kindergarten and 1st grade received Jumpstart as part of their daily literacy instruction.

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?

We used LinkIt, Reading A to Z, RAZ Kids.

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

Yes, LinkIt did because it provided the teachers with instant data to guide their instruction.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	63% of students	Data not available	Basic Skills (Jump Start)	Our Basic skills students in 4th and 5th grade received small group interventions based on the curriculum being taught in the class. The difficulty that we face is enough resources (teachers) to service all of the students in the most effective way possible. The program was successful since we got creative with the schedule. The students got basic skill attention based on what was being taught in the class, almost as reinforcement.
Grade 5	62 % of students	Data not available	Basic Skills (Jumpstart)	Our Basic skills students in 4th and 5th grade received small group interventions based on the curriculum being taught in the class. The difficulty that we face is enough resources (teachers) to service all of the students in the most effective way possible. The program was successful since we got creative with the schedule. The students got basic skill attention based on what was being taught in the class, almost as reinforcement.

Mathematics	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	45% of students	Data not available	Basic Skills	Our Basic skills students in 4th and 5th grade received small group interventions based on the curriculum being taught in the class. The difficulty that we face is enough resources (teachers) to service all of the students in the most effective way possible. The program was successful since we got creative with the schedule. The students got

				basic skill attention based on what was being taught in the class, almost as reinforcement.
Grade 5	16% of students	Data not available	Basic Skills	Our Basic skills students in 4th and 5th grade received small group interventions based on the curriculum being taught in the class. The difficulty that we face is enough resources (teachers) to service all of the students in the most effective way possible. The program was successful since we got creative with the schedule. The students got basic skill attention based on what was being taught in the class, almost as reinforcement.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance
Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Kindergarten	36	27	"Jumpstart to Literacy" "The Daily Five"	While Freehold Borough did see growth in students who were reading below grade level (went from 31% to 20%), we are in our first full year of implementation of the Jumpstart to Literacy Program. The Daily Five was implemented to improve independent reading as well as reading stamina.
Grade 1	29	23	"Jumpstart to Literacy"	While Freehold Borough did see growth in students who were reading below grade level (went from 36% to 25%), we are in our first full year of implementation of the Jumpstart to Literacy Program. The Daily Five was implemented to improve independent reading as well as reading stamina.
Grade 2	41	33	Guided Reading Intervention Trainings/Workshops	Teachers were explicitly trained in Guided Reading throughout the school year. The workshops highlighted

				reading/comprehension techniques and strategies to specifically help struggling readers.

Mathematics	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Kindergarten	-	14	Basic Skills, Summer Math and Literacy Program	Data that we have from a multiple measure matrix on K-2 local assessments and grading indicate 14 students who scored 2 or below (out of 4) on their report card grade, qualifying them for our Summer Program. These students will be administered benchmark assessments in the Summer Program and during the school year, which will provide the data needed for comparison. The district is currently working with a Math Committee to identify needs and strengths of the current math program.
Grade 1	-	5	Basic Skills, Summer Math and Literacy Program, T-1 program	Data that we have from a multiple measure matrix on K-2 local assessments and grading indicate 5 students who scored 2 or below (out of 4) on their report card grade, qualifying them for our Summer Program. These students will be administered benchmark assessments in the Summer Program and during the school year, which will provide the data needed for comparison. The district is currently working with a Math Committee to identify needs and strengths of the current math program.
Grade 2	-	24	Basic Skills, Summer Math and Literacy Program, LinkIt	Data that we have from a multiple measure matrix on K-2 local assessments and grading indicate 24 students who scored 2 or below (out of 4) on their report card grade, qualifying them for our Summer Program. These students will be administered benchmark assessments in the Summer Program and during the school year, which will provide the data needed for comparison. The district is currently working with a Math Committee to identify needs and strengths of the current math program.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Title I Morning Literacy Program Grades 2-3 Title I Summer Literacy Program Extended School Year Program Jumpstart to Literacy-Grade 1	Y	Fountas and Pinnell Reading Level	Students averaged an increase of one F&P reading level by the end of the program. Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Basic Skills	N	Final Grades	The final grade average for grades 2-5 was 79%
ELA	Homeless	Jumpstart to Literacy	Y	F&P, Slosson and Fry	F&P: Increased 2 levels; Slosson: increased 47%; Fry: Increased 53%
Math	Homeless	Basic Skills	N	Final Grades	The final grade average for grades 2-5 was 79%
ELA	Migrant		N/A		
Math	Migrant		N/A		
ELA	ELLs	Language Assistance and Literacy Program Title I Literacy Program Jumpstart to Literacy-	Y	F&P reading levels	Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Grade 1			
Math	ELLs	Basic Skills	N	Final Grades	The final grade average for grades 2-5 was 79%
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Language Assistance and Literacy Program Title1 Literacy Program Title 1 Morning Literacy Program Grades 2-3 Jumpstart to Literacy-Grade 1	Y	F&P reading levels Slosson and Fry Lists	Students went up 2.5 levels during the 20 week program. Students went up 1 reading level on average during the 8 week program. Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Basic Skills	N	Final Grades	The final grade average for grades 2-5 was 79%

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Extended Day/Year Interventions – **Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Title I Morning Literacy Program Grades 2-3 Title I Summer Literacy Program Extended School Year Program	Y	F & P Reading Level	Students averaged an increase of one F&P reading level by the end of the program. Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Math Summer Program	N	Form B Benchmark	Students average score on the first benchmark they completed was 39%, which falls in the partial proficiency range.
ELA	Homeless	Title I Morning Literacy Program Grades 2-3 Title I Summer Literacy Program	N	Form B Benchmark	The homeless student scored a 29% on the ELA benchmark administered, which falls in the partial proficiency range.
Math	Homeless	Math Summer Program	Y	Form B Benchmark	The homeless student scored a 60% on the Math benchmark administered, which falls in the proficient range.
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A		
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A		
ELA	ELLs	Language Assistance and Literacy Program	Y	F&P reading levels	Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Title1 Math and Literacy Program	Y		on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%.
Math	ELLs	Math Summer Program	Y	Form B Benchmark	Students average score on the first benchmark they completed was 50%, which falls in the proficient range.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Language Assistance and Literacy Program Title1 Math and Literacy Program Title 1 Morning Literacy Program Grades 2-3	Y	F&P reading levels Slosson and Fry Lists	Students went up 2.5 levels during the 20 week program. Students went up 1 reading level on average during the 8 week program Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on avg of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Math Summer Program	Partial	Form B Benchmark	Students average score on the first benchmark they completed was 49%, which falls in the at-risk proficient range, 1% away from proficient.
1 Content					
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Title 1Morning Literacy Program Grades 2-3 Title 1 Summer Math and Literacy Program Extended School Year	Y	F & P Reading Level	Students averaged an increase of one F&P reading level by the end of the program. Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Program			on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Math Summer Program	N	Form B Benchmark	Students average score on the first benchmark they completed was 39%, which falls in the partial proficiency range.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Outside consultant for differentiation of instruction Reading Workshop model Learning Fair Jumpstart	Y	Teacher feedback and sign in sheets	The average students test scores on Form B were 51%, indicating that the students performed in the proficient range following the PD provided.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Outside consultant for differentiation of instruction	Y	Teacher feedback and sign in sheets	The average students test scores on Form B were 78.5%, indicating that the students performed in the advanced proficient range following the PD provided.
ELA	Homeless	Reading Workshop model Learning Fair Jumpstart	N	Teacher feedback and sign in sheets	The homeless student scored a 29% on the ELA benchmark administered, which falls in the partial proficiency range.
Math	Homeless	Learning Fair LinkIt	Y Y	Teacher feedback and sign in sheets	The homeless student scored a 60% on the Math benchmark administered, which falls in the proficient range.
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	SIOP Reading Workshop model	Y	Teacher feedback and sign in sheets	Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Learning Fair Jumpstart			on average of 39%.
Math	ELLs	SIOP Learning Fair	Y	Teacher feedback and sign in sheets	Students average score on the first benchmark they completed was 50%, which falls in the proficient range.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Learning Fair Jumpstart Reading Workshop	Y	Teacher feedback and sign in sheets	The average students test scores on Form B were 52.3%, indicating that the students performed in the proficient range following the PD provided.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Learning Fair	Y	Teacher feedback and sign in sheets	The average students test scores on Form B were 63%, indicating that the students performed in the proficient range following the PD provided.

Family and Community Engagement **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Y	Sign in Sheets(Attendance)	Literacy Night: 27 students represented by their parents at Family Literacy Night Homework Diner: 93 families attended over 5 months. Jumpstart Parent Workshop: 6 sets of parents attended
Math	Students with	Homework Diner	Y	Sign in Sheets(Attendance)	Literacy Night: 27 students represented by

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	Disabilities	Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop			their parents at Family Literacy Night Homework Diner: 93 families attended over 5 months. Jumpstart Parent Workshop: 6 sets of parents attended
ELA	Homeless	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Y	Sign in Sheets(Attendance)	Literacy Night: 27 students represented by their parents at Family Literacy Night Homework Diner: 93 families attended over 5 months. Jumpstart Parent Workshop: 6 sets of parents attended
Math	Homeless		Y	Sign in Sheets(Attendance)	Literacy Night: 27 students represented by their parents at Family Literacy Night Homework Diner: 93 families attended over 5 months. Jumpstart Parent Workshop: 6 sets of parents attended
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	ELLs	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop ELL Parent Workshop	Y	Sign in Sheets(Attendance)	Literacy Night: 27 students represented by their parents at Family Literacy Night Homework Diner: 93 families attended over 5 months. Jumpstart Parent Workshop: 6 sets of parents attended ELL Parent Workshop: 70
Math	ELLs	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop ELL Parent Workshop	Y	Sign in Sheets(Attendance)	Literacy Night: 27 students represented by their parents at Family Literacy Night Homework Diner: 93 families attended over 5 months. Jumpstart Parent Workshop: 6 sets of parents attended ELL Parent Workshop: 70
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Y	Sign in Sheets(Attendance)	Literacy Night: 27 students represented by their parents at Family Literacy Night Homework Diner: 93 families attended over 5 months. Jumpstart Parent Workshop: 6 sets of parents

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					attended
Math	Economically Disadvantaged		Y	Sign in Sheets(Attendance)	Literacy Night: 27 students represented by their parents at Family Literacy Night Homework Diner: 93 families attended over 5 months. Jumpstart Parent Workshop: 6 sets of parents attended

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note: Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A scanned copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☑ I certify that the school's stakeholder/schoolwide committee conducted and completed the required Title I schoolwide evaluation as required for the completion of this Title I Schoolwide Plan. Per this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the identification of all programs and activities that were funded by Title I, Part A.

_____   _____   _____

Principal's Name (Print)   **Principal's Signature**   **Date**

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). "

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Data Collection and Analysis

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2015-2016

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	Benchmark Data Analyzed standardized test scores	83% of students who took LAL benchmark Form B (February, 2015) were considered At Risk based on a "cut line" developed by LinkIt! Grade 3:90% at risk Grade 4: 81% at risk Grade 5: 76% at risk
Academic Achievement - Writing	Included in LAL (Benchmark) data above	83% of students who took LAL benchmark Form B (February, 2015) were considered At Risk based on a "cut line" developed by LinkIt! Grade 3:90% at risk Grade 4: 81% at risk Grade 5: 76% at risk
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Benchmark Assessment State Testing	56% of students who tool Math benchmark Form B (February, 2015) were considered At Risk based on a "cut line" developed by LinkIt! Grade 3: 64% Grade 4: 56% Grade 5: 45%
Family and Community	Family Surveys and Feedback	80% of families strongly agree that our events are well organized, 20%

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Engagement	forms	agree. 84% of families strongly agree that they learned information that was useful to them, as it pertained to the topic, 16% agree. 95% of families strongly agree that they enjoyed the individual teacher guidance, 5% agree. 78% of families strongly agree they are more confident in the reading and math skills to assist their children, 21% of families agree, 1% of families were neutral.
Professional Development	Staff Survey and Feedback form	In a survey to teachers, they responded strongly to needing new methods of instruction (PD) in multiple subject areas. Reading: 48.15% of teachers would like PD on new instruction methods Math: 57.69% of teachers would like PD on new instruction methods
Leadership	FBEA School Climate and Culture	In the category of "I have the respect and support of my principal," 89% of the staff either agreed or strongly disagreed
School Climate and Culture	FBEA School Climate and Culture	In the category of "which of the following describes your overall level of satisfaction," over 86% of the staff selected either Very satisfied or Somewhat satisfied.
School-Based Youth Services	YMCA	18 of 25 selected Freehold Borough Kindergarten students funded by the United Way attend the YMCA
Students with Disabilities	F & P Reading Level Benchmark Assessment	Students averaged an increase of one F&P reading level by the end of the program. Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%. Students average score on the first benchmark they completed was 39%, which falls in the partial proficiency range.
Homeless Students	Benchmark Assessments	The homeless student scored a 29% on the ELA benchmark administered,

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		which falls in the partial proficiency range. The homeless student scored a 60% on the Math benchmark administered, which falls in the proficient range.
Migrant Students	N/A	
English Language Learners	F & P Reading Level FRY and Slosson Words Benchmark Assessments	Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%. Students average score on the first benchmark they completed was 50%, which falls in the proficient range.
Economically Disadvantaged	F & P Reading Level FRY and Slosson Words Final Grades	Students went up 2.5 levels during the 20 week program. Students went up 1 reading level on average during the 8 week program. Students increased by 5 levels on average during the year; Slosson: Students increased on average of 47%; Fry: Students increased on average of 39%. The final grade average for grades 2-5 was 79%

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*
Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment?

   We utilized a survey to conduct the Comprehensive Needs Assessment.

2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?

   We utilized our LinkIt navigator reports and dashboard reports to collect and compile data for student subgroups.

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?

   The questions utilized in the survey came directly from the grant.

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?

   The analysis revealed that we need additional space in our buildings for small group instruction. Also, more teachers are needed to have effective small group instruction.

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?

   Data revealed that staff members appreciated that the district had common initiatives. Teachers also enjoyed getting to choose Professional Development that was important to them (Learning Fair).

6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?

   The school utilized local benchmarks, F&P scores, Sort word list scores and Slossen word list scores.

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students?

   We utilized small group instruction (4 to 1 groups) and differentiated instruction.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students?

   We do not have any migrant students.

9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students?

   The Principal, Guidance Counselor, and Nurse meet to discuss homeless students. We provide resources to these students such as the Amistad Homework Club and collaborate with Child Protection and Permanency.

10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?

    The school provides PD regarding the data collection.

11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school?

    We have a Pre-K/Kindergarten Orientation. We also have a transitional activity day and Borough Buddy Day to help support 5th grade students making the transition to middle school.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan?

    We utilized a survey to gather information from the teachers and met with administrators, staff members, and parents.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	The majority of students are reading below grade level.	Utilization of data to inform instruction
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Based on the Needs Assessment Survey and F & P data, students are reading below grade level.	We previously used Scantron Achievement Series for our benchmark assessment. These assessments-created by teachers-did not accurately reflect the common core standards, and therefore, did not accurately predict how students would perform on standardized tests.
Describe the root causes of the problem	Students are entering our school reading below grade level and many do not have the parental support. Also, until this year we have not had a singular approach regarding reading instruction.	Teachers were not effectively trained with how to use Scantron and the program did not come equipped with quality assessments.
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELL, Special Education, Economically Disadvantaged	ELL, Special Education, Economically Disadvantaged
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Mathematics, Social Studies, Science	Math and Language Arts
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12
How does the intervention align with the Common	The Common Core requires students to read complex tests and utilize critical thinking, problem-solving and analytical	The increased demands on students with the implementation of the Common Core require educators

Core State Standards?	skills that are needed to be successful in college and their careers.	make sure students are on grade level. Data driven instruction is an important to ensure that this takes place.

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Parent Involvement	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	The data gained from Literacy Night and Homework Diner indicates that we need to increase parent involvement.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Many of our parents	
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELL, Special Education,	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	ELA, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	In order for students to acquire college and career readiness, and given the increased complexity and demands that are placed on students from the Common Core, it is essential that parents are there to support there student academic progress.	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . "

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) *strengthen the core academic program in the school;*					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Reading Workshop Jumpstart Fundations	Principal District Reading Coach Director of Special Services	F&P reading assessment	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14
Math	Students with Disabilities	LinkIt	Principal Director of Special Services Director of Curriculum and Instruction	LinkIt	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12
ELA	Homeless	Reading Workshop Jumpstart	Principal District Reading Coach	F&P reading assessment	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Math	Homeless	LinkIt	Principal Director of Curriculum and Instruction	LinkIt	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12
ELA	Migrant	N/A			Corrective Reading
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	Reading Workshop Jumpstart	Principal District Reading Coach ESL Supervisor	F&P reading assessment	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14
Math	ELLs	LinkIt	Principal Director of Curriculum and Instruction ESL	Benchmark Assessments	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) *strengthen the core academic program in the school*;					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			Supervisor		
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Reading Workshop Jumpstart	Principal District Reading Coach	F&P Assessments	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	LinkIt	Principal Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Benchmark Assessments	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) *increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum*;					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	NCLB Summer Math and Literacy program Extended School Year Program	District Reading Coach Director of	Pre and post assessments- F&P reading assessment	Extended School Day – Research Brief http://eric.ed.gov/?q=extended+school+day&id=ED537590

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Extended Day Program	Special Services Reading Coach		
Math	Students with Disabilities	NCLB Summer Math and Literacy program Extended School Year Program	Reading Coach Director of Special Services	Pre and post assessments	Extended School Day – Research Brief http://eric.ed.gov/?q=extended+school+day&id=ED537590
ELA	Homeless	Jumpstart Extended Day Program	Reading Coach	Pre and post assessments- F&P reading assessment	Extended School Day – Research Brief http://eric.ed.gov/?q=extended+school+day&id=ED537590
Math	Homeless	LinkIt	Principal Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Benchmark Assessment	Extended School Day – Research Brief http://eric.ed.gov/?q=extended+school+day&id=ED537590
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	NCLB Summer Math and Literacy program	Reading Coach	F&P reading assessment, Benchmark	Extended School Day – Research Brief http://eric.ed.gov/?q=extended+school+day&id=ED537590

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Extended Day Program	ESL Supervisor	Assessment	
Math	ELLs	NCLB Summer Math and Literacy program ESL Supervisor	Reading Coach ESL Supervisor	Benchmark Assessment	Extended School Day – Research Brief http://eric.ed.gov/?q=extended+school+day&id=ED537590
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	NCLB Summer Math and Literacy program Extended School Year Program Extended Day Program	Reading Coach	F&P reading assessment, benchmark assessment	Extended School Day – Research Brief http://eric.ed.gov/?q=extended+school+day&id=ED537590
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	NCLB Summer Math and Literacy program	Reading Coach	Benchmark assessment	Extended School Day – Research Brief http://eric.ed.gov/?q=extended+school+day&id=ED537590

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Outside consultant for differentiation of instruction Reading Workshop model Learning Fair Jumpstart	Principal Reading Coach Director of Curriculum and Instruction	F&P assessments, LinkIt, teacher suveys	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14
Math	Students with Disabilities	Learning Fair LinkIt	Principal Reading Coach Director of Curriculum and Instruction	LinkIt, teacher Survey	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12
ELA	Homeless	Reading Workshop model Learning Fair	Principal Reading	F&P assessments, LinkIt, teacher suveys	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Jumpstart	Coach Director of Curriculum and Instruction		Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14
Math	Homeless	Learning Fair LinkIt		Teacher Survey, LinkIt	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	Reading Workshop model Learning Fair Jumpstart	Principal Reading Coach Director of Curriculum and Instruction	F&P assessments, LinkIt, teacher suveys	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			ESL Supervisor		
Math	ELLs	Learning Fair LinkIt	Director of Curriculum and Instruction ESL Supervisor	LinkIt, teacher suveys	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Reading Workshop model Learning Fair Jumpstart	Principal Reading Coach Director of Curriculum and Instruction	F&P assessments, LinkIt, teacher suveys	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Learning Fair LinkIt	Principal Director of Curriculum	F&P assessments, LinkIt, teacher suveys	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			and Instruction		
ELA		Reading Workshop model Learning Fair Jumpstart	Principal Director of Curriculum and Instruction	F&P assessments, LinkIt, teacher suveys	Corrective Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=120 Improving reading comprehension Kindergarten through 3rd grade http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide.aspx?sid=14
Math		Learning Fair LinkIt	Principal Director of Curriculum and Instruction	LinkIt, teacher surveys	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?

    The external evaluation will take place on a quarterly basis by school staff and we will also survey parents.

2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?

    Our implementation of Readers Workshop will be a challenge as it is new to teachers. Also finding enough teachers who can work in the morning/afternoon to staff our extended day program.

3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?

    We did provide Readers Workshop at the end of the 2014-15 school year and we will continue to provide PD during the 2015-2016 school year. Teachers have told us that they appreciate this type of support and they are appreciative that we have a singular approach with reading instruction.

4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?

    We will use meetings and surveys.

5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?

    We will use meetings and surveys.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

6. How will the school structure interventions?

   The school will implement the Jumpstart program in 12 week cycles in our Basic Skills and Extended Day programs. Benchmark Assessments will take place three times a year. Jumpstart and Reading Workshop professional development will take place throughout the year.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

   Students will receive Jumpstart and Reading Workshop daily. Benchmark assessments will be taken three times a year.

8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?

   LinkIt will be used to administer benchmark assessments and for data analysis.

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?

   F & P reading assessments and benchmark data will be used.

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?

    On-line surveys and meetings will take place with staff members and parents.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802
Math	Students with Disabilities	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802
ELA	Homeless	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802
Math	Homeless	Homework Diner	Principals	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator		http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802
Math	ELLs	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			Title I Coordinator		
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802
ELA		Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802
Math		Homework Diner Literacy Night Jumpstart Parent Workshop	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Title I Coordinator	Parent Surveys	Parent Involvement: What research says to administrators http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ351802

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?

   Homework Dinner and Literacy Night are focused on helping parents support their children with reading and other core subjects the students are studying in school.

2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?

   During Back to School Night, we will have a separate Title I meeting to solicit parent assistance with writing the parent involvement policy, as well as update them on the policies and procedures involved with NCLB.

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?

   We will post it on our website and send it home to families through a backpack distribution.

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?

   The school will reach out to families to ask for their assistance in developing the school-parent compact. Families will also be notified of this opportunity during the Title I Annual Meeting.

5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?

   The school-parent compact will go home with students when they return to school. It will go home with a welcome packet and/or be included in their agenda. Families will sign the compact.

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?

   Students achievement data is reported to families at a Board of Education meeting, as well as is posted on the school website.

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III?

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

The district will post this information on their school website. Additionally, the action plan to address the AMAOs is approved at a Board of Education meeting.

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?

   Students achievement data is reported to families at a Board of Education meeting and families will be mailed their student's personalized test scores.

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan?

   On-line surveys and meetings.

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children?

    Progress notes, reports cards, Parent/Teacher conferences.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?

    The district will continue offering the Homework Diner and Family Literacy Night to families, as they were well received in the current school year. Additionally, we will add in a math and science night for families to take part in.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	39	The district has a comprehensive mentoring program. Teachers are supported with relevant PD and opportunities for professional growth.
	100%	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0	
	0%	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	10	Paraprofessionals are included in district professional development activities and are supported by building administration as well as staff and administration in the Special Programs department.
	100%	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0	
	0%	

* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
The Freehold Borough School district implements rigorous hiring practices designed to identify highly qualified candidates. Newly hired teachers are provided with an extensive new staff orientation program and are welcomed publicly at in-service sessions, faculty meetings, and Board of Education meetings. The collaborative atmosphere enjoyed by teachers, staff, and administrators in Freehold Borough provides ongoing support for continuous professional growth.	Superintendent Principals